Spanning trees with nonseparating paths[☆]

Cristina G. Fernandes[a,1], César Hernández–Vélez[a,2,*], Orlando Lee[b,3], José C. de Pina[a]

[a] *Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo. São Paulo – SP, Brazil 05508-090*
[b] *Instituto de Computação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Campinas – SP, Brazil 13083-852*

arXiv:1409.4239v1 [math.CO] 15 Sep 2014

Abstract

We consider questions related to the existence of spanning trees in graphs with the property that after the removal of any path in the tree the graph remains connected. We show that, for planar graphs, the existence of trees with this property is closely related to the Hamiltonicity of the graph. For graphs with a 1- or 2-vertex cut, the Hamiltonicity also plays a central role. We also deal with spanning trees satisfying this property restricted to paths arising from fundamental cycles. The cycle space of a graph can be generated by the fundamental cycles of any spanning tree, and Tutte showed, that for a 3-connected graph, it can be generated by nonseparating cycles. We are also interested in the existence of a fundamental basis consisting of nonseparating cycles.

Keywords: nonseparating path; spanning tree; nonseparating fundamental cycle.

1. Introduction

In this paper every graph is finite, simple and connected. The *vertex set* of a graph G is denoted by $V(G)$ and its *edge set* by $E(G)$. For any subgraph H of G, $G[H]$ is the subgraph of G induced by $V(H)$, and $G - H$ is the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) \setminus V(H)$. We say G is *k-connected* if $|V(G)| > k$ and, for every set $X \subseteq V(G)$ with $|X| < k$, $G - X$ is connected. By convention, both the *null graph* (the graph with no vertices, and hence no edges) and the *trivial graph* (any graph with just one vertex) are 0-connected and 1-connected, but are not k-connected for any $k > 1$.

If G is a graph and P a path in G, we say that P is a *nonseparating (separating) path* if $G - P$ is connected (respectively, disconnected). A path P between u and v is called a *uv-path*.

Tutte [1] proved that, for every 3-connected graph G and vertices u and v, there exists a nonseparating uv-path. In 1975, Lovász [2] made the following conjecture which is related to this result of Tutte.

Conjecture 1. For every positive integer k, there exists a positive integer $f(k)$ such that, for every $f(k)$-connected graph G and vertices u and v, there exists a uv-path P such that $G - P$ is k-connected.

It is easy to see that $f(1) \geq 3$. So, Tutte's result implies that $f(1) = 3$. Chen, Gould, and Yu [3], and independently Kriesell [4], proved that $f(2) = 5$. Recently, Kawarabayashi, Lee, and Yu [5] proved that $f(2) = 4$ except for double wheels. The conjecture is open for $k \geq 3$.

Some related questions have been settled yielding new conjectures. One of them is the following due to Kawarabayashi and Ozeki [6].

[☆]Research partially supported by CNPq (Proc. 477203/2012-4), FAPESP (Proc. 2013/03447-6), and Project MaCLinC of NUMEC/USP.

[*]Corresponding author

Email addresses: cris@ime.usp.br (Cristina G. Fernandes), israel@ime.usp.br (César Hernández–Vélez), lee@ic.unicamp.br (Orlando Lee), coelho@ime.usp.br (José C. de Pina)

[1]Partially supported by CNPq (Proc. 308523/2012-1).
[2]Supported by FAPESP (Proc. 2012/24597-3).
[3]Supported by Bolsa de Produtividade do CNPq (Proc. 303947/2008-0) and Edital Universal CNPq (Proc. 477692/2012-5).

Conjecture 2. For all positive integers k and ℓ, there exists a positive integer $g(k,\ell)$ such that the following holds. For every $g(k,\ell)$-connected graph G and vertices u and v, there exist internally disjoint uv-paths $P_1,\ldots,P_\ell$ such that $G-\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} P_i$ is k-connected.

For $\ell = 1$ this conjecture corresponds to Lovász Conjecture. Kawarabayashi and Ozeki showed that $g(1,\ell) = 2\ell+1$ and $g(2,\ell) \leq 3\ell+2$.

Other related question was raised by Hong and Lai [7], who considered the problem of connecting a subset of vertices by a tree instead of just two vertices as in Tutte's theorem. They made the conjecture below.

Conjecture 3. For all positive integers k and r, there exists a positive integer $h(k,r)$ such that, for every $h(k,r)$-connected graph G and subset X with r vertices, there exists a tree T connecting X such that $G-T$ is k-connected.

Hong and Lai proved that $h(1,r) = r+1$ and $h(2,r) \leq 2r+1$.

By Tutte, in a 3-connected graph, every pair of vertices is connected by a nonseparating path. *Is it possible to get a spanning tree where all paths are nonseparating?* Inspired by Tutte's result on nonseparating paths, we call *Tutte tree* any spanning tree of a graph such that every path in the tree is nonseparating. In this paper we deal with the following question.

Question 4. When does a graph have a Tutte tree?

For planar graphs we prove the following.

Theorem 5. *A planar graph has a Tutte tree if and only if it is Hamiltonian or it has a spanning tree whose leaves induce a triangle.*

We denote the set of leaves in a tree T by $L(T)$. We prove the theorem below.

Theorem 6. *Let G be a graph and T be a spanning tree. If $G[L(T)]$ is 3-connected, then T is a Tutte tree.*

A cycle C is a *nonseparating (separating) cycle* if $G-C$ is connected (respectively, disconnected). We adopt the convention that a Hamiltonian cycle is nonseparating. Let T be a spanning tree of G. For every $e \in E(G) \setminus E(T)$, there is a unique cycle C_e in $T+e$. These cycles C_e are called *fundamental cycles* (of G) with respect to T.

Tutte [1] proved that the cycle space of a 3-connected graph is generated by its nonseparating induced cycles. Once more, inspired by a result of Tutte we say that a spanning tree T of a graph is a *fundamental Tutte tree* if any fundamental cycle with respect to T is nonseparating.

We present a question concerning fundamental Tutte trees similar to Question 4.

Question 7. When does a graph have a fundamental Tutte tree?

This question corresponds to asking if there is a fundamental basis of the cycle space consisting of nonseparating cycles. For the case of planar graphs, we prove the following.

Theorem 8. *Let G be a planar graph and T be a spanning tree. If T is a fundamental Tutte tree, then in any plane drawing of G all leaves are in the same face.*

It is easy to see that if T is a Tutte tree of G, then T is a fundamental Tutte tree. However, as we shall see, not every graph with a fundamental Tutte tree has a Tutte tree.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we dive into Tutte trees. We analyze Tutte trees in planar graphs and prove Theorem 5. The structure of graphs with 2-vertex cut having a Tutte tree is investigated. It is shown that the problem of deciding whether a 3-connected graph has a Tutte tree is NP-complete and some examples of graphs with no Tutte tree are presented. Theorem 6 is proved and examples showing that the sufficient condition of this theorem is not a necessary one are exhibited. Next, in Section 3, the fundamental Tutte trees are contemplated. The structure of graphs having a fundamental Tutte tree with a 1-vertex cut or a 2-vertex cut are explored. Theorem 8 is proved and an example of a graph with a fundamental Tutte tree and no Tutte tree is exhibited. We conclude this section presenting a graph with no fundamental Tutte tree. Finally, in Section 4, we present some concluding remarks and open questions.

2. Tutte trees

Note that 3-connectedness is a sufficient condition for a graph to have a nonseparating path between any two vertices. However, it is not a necessary condition. A cycle of length at least three, which is 2-connected but not 3-connected, has a nonseparating path between any two vertices. The following observation is trivial, but important.

Observation 9. *Every graph G with a Tutte tree has connectivity at least* 2.

In order to prove Theorem 5 we first prove a lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let G be a planar graph and T be a spanning tree. If T is a Tutte tree then $G[L(T)]$ is a clique.*

Proof. Suppose that T is Tutte tree of G and there exist two nonadjacent leaves of T. We claim that there is a separating path in T.

Let D be a plane drawing of G. Let u and v be two nonadjacent leaves of T. Since G is 2-connected, u has at least two neighbors. Let $N(u)$ denote the set of neighbors of u in G. For any two vertices $x, y \in N(u)$ there exists a unique path between them in T, denoted by xTy . Thus, $xTy \cup \{yu, ux\}$ is a cycle in G denoted by C_{xy}, and it is represented by the Jordan curve $D[C_{xy}]$ in D. As v is not adjacent to u, we have that $x, y \neq v$, and as v is a leaf, the cycle C_{xy} does not contain v. Without loss of generality, we may assume that v is inside the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{xy}]$. Let $u_1, u_2 \in N(u)$ be such that: (i) v is inside the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{u_1u_2}]$, and (ii) if C_{xy} is another cycle containing v inside the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{xy}]$ then $D[C_{u_1u_2}]$ is contained in the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{xy}]$.

No vertex $u' \in N(u)$ is inside the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{u_1u_2}]$. Indeed, suppose that there exists such a u'. Since D is a plane drawing of G, both, the path $D[u'Tu_1]$ and the path $D[u'Tu_2]$ are inside the closed disk bounded by $D[C_{u_1u_2}]$. Thus one of $C_{u_1u'}$ or $C_{u'u_2}$ contains v in the interior of the Jordan curve that it induces, contradicting the choice of $C_{u_1u_2}$.

Also, no vertex in the interior of $D[C_{u_1u_2}]$ has as a neighbor a vertex in the exterior. Therefore $G - u_1Tu_2$ has at least two different components, one containing u and another containing v. Therefore the path u_1Tu_2 is separating. □

Proof of Theorem 5. ($\Rightarrow$) Let T be a Tutte tree of a planar graph G. By Lemma 10, $G[L(T)]$ is a clique. As G is planar, $G[L(T)]$ is either an edge e or a triangle, otherwise G contains a K_5 minor. In the first case, $T + e$ is a Hamiltonian cycle.
($\Leftarrow$) If G has a Hamiltonian cycle C and e is an edge of C, then $C - e$ is a Tutte tree. If T is a spanning tree such that its leaves induce a triangle, then it is trivial to check that all paths in T are nonseparating. □

Corollary 11. *Let G be a planar graph. If G has a Tutte tree, then G is traceable, i.e., has a Hamiltonian path.*

Proof. Let T be a Tutte tree in G. By Theorem 5, the tree T cannot have more than three leaves. If T has only two leaves, then G is Hamiltonian, and hence traceable. If T has three leaves, then T is homeomorphic to a 3-star, and it is not hard to find a Hamiltonian path in G using one of the edges between two of the leaves of T. □

Corollary 12. *Every* 4*-connected planar graph has a Tutte tree.*

Proof. If T is a spanning tree that results of removing an edge from a Hamiltonian cycle of G, then T is a Tutte tree. Since Tutte [8] proved that every 4-connected planar graph is Hamiltonian, the corollary follows. □

One could try to prove that every 3-connected planar graph which has a Tutte tree with three leaves is Hamiltonian. However this is not true. Consider for instance the Herschel graph (Figure 5), which is the smallest nonhamiltonian *polyhedral* (planar 3-connected) graph, and replace two degree three vertices by a triangle as in Figure 1. The resulting graph is also planar and nonhamiltonian but has a Tutte tree with three leaves.



Figure 1: Nonhamiltonian planar graph with a Tutte tree in dashed edges.

Lemma 13. *There are infinitely many planar 3-connected graphs with no Tutte tree.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 5$ be an integer and H_n be a 3-connected planar triangulation with n vertices. We colour these vertices black. For each face of H_n, we add a new vertex which is joined to the three black vertices in the face. We colour the new vertices white. Let G_n be the resulting graph.

Trivially G_n is planar and 3-connected. Since G_n has n black vertices then, from Euler's formula, it follows that G_n has $2n-4$ white vertices. Since white vertices are not adjacent to each other, every spanning tree in G_n has at least two white vertices as leaves. Hence, by Theorem 5, graph G_n has no Tutte tree. □

For describing the structure of a 2-connected graph with a Tutte tree, we need to recall some concepts. Let H be a proper subgraph of a connected graph G. We say B is an *H-bridge* in G if:

(i) B is an edge of $E(G) \setminus E(H)$ with both ends in $V(H)$; or

(ii) B is the union of a component C of $G - H$ plus all edges connecting C to H.

The vertices of H that have neighbors in B are *vertices of attachment* of B.

It follows from the definition that any two vertices of B are connected in B by a path internally disjoint from H; and any two different bridges intersect only in vertices of H. For an H-bridge B, the vertices $V(B) \setminus V(H)$ are its *internal vertices*. A bridge is *trivial* if it has no internal vertex; that is, it is an edge.

Lemma 14. *Let G be a 2-connected graph and $\{u, v\}$ be a 2-vertex cut. If G has a Tutte tree, then exactly one of the following holds: (i) there are two $\{u, v\}$-bridges in G and at least one has a Hamiltonian uv-path; or (ii) there are three $\{u, v\}$-bridges in G, one is trivial and another one has a Hamiltonian uv-path.*

Proof. Let $\{u, v\}$ be a 2-vertex cut and suppose that G has a Tutte tree T. Let uTv be the unique path between u and v in T. By the definition of bridge, uTv is contained in a $\{u, v\}$-bridges. Since we only consider simple graphs, at most one $\{u, v\}$-bridge is trivial. If there are two $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then uTv must be a Hamiltonian uv-path in its bridge, otherwise uTv is separating. If there are three $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then one must be trivial and uTv must be a Hamiltonian uv-path in another bridge that contains uTv, otherwise uTv would be separating. In the case of at least four $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then $G - uTv$ has two components. □

The structure of a 3-connected graph with a Tutte tree is very related to Hamiltonicity, as well as graphs with a 2-vertex cut as we observed in the previous result, so the problem of finding a Tutte tree turns out to be a hard problem.

Lemma 15. *Deciding if a cubic planar 3-connected graph with no facial triangles has a Tutte tree is an NP-complete problem.*

Proof. Let G be a cubic planar 3-connected graph with no facial triangles. If G has a triangle Δ, then $G-\Delta$ is disconnected. It follows that it is not possible to get a spanning tree of G whose leaves are exactly the vertices of Δ. Thus, from Theorem 5, G has a Tutte tree if and only if it is Hamiltonian. On other hand, Garey, Johnson, and Tarjan [9] proved that, for cubic planar 3-connected graphs, deciding the existence of a Hamiltonian cycle is an NP-complete problem. Hence the lemma follows. □

Proof of Theorem 6. Let P be a path in T. Clearly P contains at most two vertices of $L(T)$, and therefore $G[L(T)] - P$ is connected. Note that every component of $G - P$ has a leaf of T. It follows that P is nonseparating and hence T is a Tutte tree. □

In the nonplanar case, the 3-connectedness in $L(T)$ is a sufficient but not necessary condition. There exist Tutte trees where $G[L(T)]$ is for instance an independent set (Figure 2a), a path (Figure 2b), or a cycle (Figure 2c).



(a) Barycentric subdivision of K_5 in the projective plane.

(b) $K_{3,3}$ in the projective plane.

(c) Petersen graph.

Figure 2: 3-connected nonplanar graphs with a Tutte tree in dashed edges.

Unlike the planar graphs, the existence of a Tutte tree in a nonplanar graph implies neither a Hamiltonian cycle nor a Hamiltonian path. See for instance the 3-connected nonplanar graph $K_{3,5}$ (Figure 3).



Figure 3: Nontraceable and thus nonhamiltonian,
3-connected nonplanar graph with a Tutte tree in dashed edges.

As in the planar case, 3-connectedness is not a sufficient condition for the existence of a Tutte tree in a nonplanar graph.



Figure 4: Graph S, which is 3-connected nonplanar with no Tutte tree.

Proposition 16. *Let S be the graph obtained as follows: take a set of five white vertices, then, for each three of these, add a new black vertex and join it to each of the three vertices (Figure 4) Then S is 3-connected and does not have a Tutte tree.*

Proof. Clearly S is 3-connected and bipartite. Let us suppose that G has a Tutte tree T.

If T has a path of length six between two white vertices, i.e., a path with four white vertices, then this is a separating path since at least one of the black vertices associated with a triple formed by these four white vertices is not an inner vertex in such a path. So, we may assume T does not contains a path with four white vertices.

Since no black vertex is adjacent to all five white vertices, T has a path with at least three white vertices. Let P be a path in T with exactly three white vertices, two of which are ends. Let v_1, v_2 denote the remaining two white vertex of $S - P$. Then, the path connecting v_i to P in T, called v_iP-path, has as vertex of attachment an inner vertex of P or there would be a path with four white vertices in T. Let T' be the subtree resulting from the union of P and the v_1P-,v_2P-paths in T. One can verify that, in all possible configurations of T', the number of paths with three white vertices is greater than the number of black vertices in T' and therefore T has a separating path, namely, the path containing three white vertices in T' whose corresponding black vertex is not in T'. □

3. Fundamental Tutte trees

Unlike a Tutte tree, if a graph is connected but not 2-connected, a fundamental Tutte tree can exist. For instance, a path has a fundamental Tutte tree: itself. Indeed, it does not have any (fundamental) cycle. Note that every Tutte tree is a fundamental Tutte tree.

In order to better understand graphs with a fundamental Tutte tree, we explore their structure.

Lemma 17. *A graph G with a cut vertex has a fundamental Tutte tree if and only if (i) every nontrivial block of G is a leaf in the block tree of G, (ii) every nontrivial block of G is Hamiltonian, and (iii) every articulation vertex of a nontrivial block of G has degree two in the nontrivial block.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) *(i)* If a nontrivial block is not a leaf in the block tree, then it has at least two articulation vertices, say u and v. Since it is 2-connected, it contains a cycle with u and v. It is known that the fundamental cycles form a basis of the cycle space [10, Theorem 1.9.5]. It follows that any spanning tree of G has a fundamental cycle containing u inside the block. Such a cycle separates the blocks attached to u from the blocks attached to v. Thus every nontrivial block must be a leaf in the block tree of G.

(ii) Let u be an articulation point of a nontrivial block of G. Then u is contained in some fundamental cycle on the tree in this block. If such a cycle does not contain all vertices in the block, then it separates the blocks attached to u from the rest of the block. Hence this fundamental cycle containing u also contains

all vertices in the block. It follows that the block is Hamiltonian and the fundamental Tutte tree restricted to the block is a Hamiltonian path of the block.

(iii) Let u be as in the proof of *(ii)*. Suppose that u has degree greater than two in the nontrivial block. Then at least one edge adjacent to u is a chord of the fundamental cycle of the tree containing u in the block, which is also a Hamiltonian cycle in the block, as argued for *(ii)*. Thus the fundamental cycle induced by the chord does not contain all vertices of the block and separates the blocks attached to u from the rest of the block. Hence u has degree two in the block.

($\Leftarrow$) Let T' be obtained from the block tree of G by removing the nontrivial blocks, which are leaves. For every nontrivial block, we choose a Hamiltonian path that results of the Hamiltonian cycle after removing an edge incident to the articulation point. Joining each Hamiltonian path to the tree T' yields a spanning tree T. It is not hard to see that T is a fundamental Tutte tree of G. □

We now start to describe the structure of graphs with a 2-vertex cut that have a Tutte tree.

Lemma 18. *Let G be a 2-connected graph and $\{u, v\}$ be a 2-vertex cut. If G has a fundamental Tutte tree, then there are at most three $\{u, v\}$-bridges in G.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{u, v\}$ has at least four $\{u, v\}$-bridges and that G has a fundamental Tutte tree T. Because of the 2-connectedness, every $\{u, v\}$-bridge has a uv-path. It follows that at least three $\{u, v\}$-bridges have an edge not in T that induces a fundamental cycle, and every fundamental cycle is contained in the union of at most two $\{u, v\}$-bridges. Since we only consider simple graphs, at most one $\{u, v\}$-bridge is trivial. If G has a trivial $\{u, v\}$-bridge then it belongs to T, otherwise its fundamental cycle separates the others (nontrivial) $\{u, v\}$-components. If a fundamental cycle is contained in the union of two $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then it separates the others $\{u, v\}$-components. (Note that whenever G has a trivial $\{u, v\}$-bridge, every fundamental cycle in two $\{u, v\}$-bridges contains it and the remaining two $\{u, v\}$-bridges are nontrivial.) Thus, every fundamental cycle of T is completely contained in a $\{u, v\}$-bridge. Therefore, the fundamental cycles of T do not generate the cycles containing edges of two $\{u, v\}$-bridges. This contradicts the fact that the fundamental cycles of a spanning tree form a basis for the cycle space [10, Theorem 1.9.5]. Hence such a tree T cannot exist. □

Corollary 19. *Let G be a 2-connected graph and $\{u, v\}$ be a 2-vertex cut. If G has a fundamental Tutte tree, then every $\{u, v\}$-bridge has a Hamiltonian uv-path, except possibly one. Moreover, if there are exactly three $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then every $\{u, v\}$-bridge has a Hamiltonian uv-path.*

Proof. Let T be a fundamental Tutte tree in G. Since the fundamental cycles of T induce a basis of the cycle space, there exists at least one fundamental cycle contained in the union of two $\{u, v\}$-bridges, B_1 and B_2, say C_{12}. If there are exactly two $\{u, v\}$-bridges, then C_{12} must contain all vertices of at least one of B_1 or B_2, and the corollary follows. If there are exactly three $\{u, v\}$-bridges, let B_3 be the other one. Similarly, there exist fundamental cycles C_{ij} contained in the union of B_i and B_j. It follows that $\{C_{ij}\}$ induces a Hamiltonian uv-path in each $\{u, v\}$-bridge. □

A *series extension* of a graph is the subdivision of an edge; a *parallel extension* is the addition of a new edge joining two adjacent vertices. We momentarily consider multigraphs. A graph is *series-parallel* if it can be obtained from K_2 by a sequence of series and parallel extensions. It is well-known that a graph is series-parallel if and only if it has no K_4 minor [11, Section 11.2].

Theorem 20. *A 2-connected series-parallel graph G has a fundamental Tutte tree if and only if, for every 2-vertex cut $\{u, v\}$, (i) there are at most three $\{u, v\}$-bridges; (ii) if there are exactly two $\{u, v\}$-bridges, one has a Hamiltonian uv-path; (iii) if there are three $\{u, v\}$-bridges, each one has a Hamiltonian uv-path and at most one is 2-edge-connected.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Recall that a series-parallel graph is planar and not 3-connected. If G is a triangle, then it has a fundamental Tutte tree and there is no 2-vertex cut. Otherwise, there exists at least one 2-vertex cut $\{u, v\}$ in G. Suppose G has a fundamental Tutte tree T. Items (i) and (ii) follow from Lemma 18 and Corollary 19, respectively.

Now, suppose that there are three $\{u, v\}$-bridges and two of them are 2-edge-connected. It follows from Corollary 19 that every $\{u, v\}$-bridge has a Hamiltonian uv-path. At least one of the 2-edge-connected $\{u, v\}$-bridges, say B, does not have a uv-path in T. Then B has an edge xy whose fundamental cycle C_{xy} contains an edge of another $\{u, v\}$-bridge B'. If C_{xy} is not a Hamiltonian cycle in the subgraph induced by the union of B and B', then C_{xy} is separating. It follows that C_{xy} restricted to B is a Hamiltonian uv-path. Without loss of generality, we may assume that there exist a ux-path and a yv-path in T whose union contains all vertices of B. Since xy is not a cut edge, there exists an edge $x'y'$ not in T connecting the ux-path and the yv-path. The fundamental cycle $C_{x'y'}$ is separating, which is a contradiction. Then at most one $\{u, v\}$-bridge is 2-edge-connected, which proves item (iii).
($\Leftarrow$) Item (i) is a necessary condition for the existence of a fundamental Tutte tree.

We define a fundamental Tutte tree according to the number of bridges:

1. *For every 2-vertex cut $\{u, v\}$ there are exactly two $\{u, v\}$-bridges.*

Let C be a longest cycle in G. If C is a Hamiltonian cycle, we are done. So suppose that there is a vertex w not in C. Since G is 2-connected, there are two distinct vertices x and y in C, and a wx-path and a wy-path internally disjoint from each other. If x and y are adjacent in C, then we get a longer cycle replacing the edge xy in C by the concatenation at w of the two paths. It follows that there is at least one vertex in each xy-path of C. Because there are exactly two $\{x, y\}$-bridges, G has a K_4 minor. Hence C is a Hamiltonian cycle. In this case, a fundamental Tutte tree is obtained from a Hamiltonian cycle by removing one edge.

2. *There exists a 2-vertex cut $\{u, v\}$ with three $\{u, v\}$-bridges.*

By item (iii), every $\{u, v\}$-bridge has a Hamiltonian uv-path and at most one of the $\{u, v\}$-bridges is 2-edge-connected. Let xy and $x'y'$ be cut edges, one for each no 2-edge-connected $\{u, v\}$-bridge. Note that, for the respective $\{u, v\}$-bridge, every Hamiltonian uv-path must contain the cut edge. The fundamental Tutte tree is as follows. Take a Hamiltonian uv-path in each $\{u, v\}$-bridge and remove edges xy and $x'y'$. It is easy to verify that every fundamental cycle is nonseparating. □

Proof of Theorem 8. The case when G has a cut vertex follows from Lemma 17. So we may assume that G is at least 2-connected. Let T be a fundamental Tutte tree and suppose that there exist a plane drawing D of G without all the leaves in the same face. Let u and v be two leaves in different faces of D. Then there exist a cycle C that separates u from v [12, Theorem 3.1]; that is, a cycle containing neither u nor v and such that they are in distinct regions of the Jordan curve $D[C]$. Since the fundamental cycles form a basis of the cycle space [10, Theorem 1.9.5], it follows that there exists a fundamental cycle C_e of T that separates u from v. Because G is planar, C_e is a separating fundamental cycle, and so we have a contradiction. □

Corollary 21. *There are infinitely many planar 3-connected graphs with no fundamental Tutte tree.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 5$ be an integer and G_n be as defined in the proof of Lemma 13. It follows that every spanning tree of G_n has at least two leaves in different faces and therefore G_n has no fundamental Tutte tree. □

If a graph has a Tutte tree, then such tree is also a fundamental Tutte tree. However, there exist (planar) 3-connected graphs with a fundamental Tutte tree, but without a Tutte tree, as for instance the Herschel graph (Figure 5), which is nonhamiltonian and has no triangles.

In the case of planar graphs, traceability is a necessary condition (Corollary 11) but not sufficient (Herschel graph) for the existence of a Tutte tree. On the other hand, there are nontraceable (and thus nonhamiltonian) cubic planar 3-connected graphs [13] with a fundamental Tutte tree, e.g., the Zamfirescu graph (Figure 6).

Having a spanning tree with all leaves in a same face does not guarantee that a plane graph has a fundamental Tutte tree.

Proposition 22. *Let G be the planar graph obtained as follows: take the Zamfirescu graph and let v_1 and v_2 be the vertices displayed in Figure 6. Let w be a new vertex and joint it to v_1 and v_2. Finally add the edge v_1v_2. Then: (i) there exist a spanning tree T of G and a plane drawing of G for which all leaves of T are in the same face; and (ii) G has no fundamental Tutte tree.*



Figure 5: Herschel graph, with a fundamental Tutte tree in dashed edges, has no Tutte tree.



Figure 6: Zamfirescu graph which is nontraceable cubic planar 3-connected with a fundamental Tutte tree in dashed edges.

Proof. We get a spanning tree T of G just adding the edge v_1w to the spanning tree in dashed edges shown in Figure 6. It is easy to obtain a plane drawing of G such that all leaves of T are in the same face. This proves (i).

By Corollary 19, if G has a fundamental Tutte tree then every $\{v_1, v_2\}$-bridge should have a Hamiltonian v_1v_2-path. The Zamfirescu graph is a $\{v_1, v_2\}$-bridge of G, but has no a Hamiltonian v_1v_2-path. It follows that G has no fundamental Tutte tree. □

4. Concluding Remarks

We have not been able to give a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of either a Tutte tree or a fundamental Tutte tree, so some interesting questions remain open.

Every 4-connected planar graph has a (fundamental) Tutte tree, since it is Hamiltonian. We do not know a 4-connected nonplanar graph with no (fundamental) Tutte tree. This yields the following question.

Question 23. Does every 4-connected graph have a (fundamental) Tutte tree?

Proposition 22 shows that the existence of a spanning tree with all its leaves in the same face is not a sufficient condition for having a fundamental Tutte tree. Nevertheless the graph constructed is not 3-connected. So some questions arise.

Question 24. Is there a 3-connected planar graph G with a spanning tree with all its leaves in the same face, such that G has not a fundamental Tutte tree?

Question 25. Let G be a 3-connected planar graph with a spanning tree whose all leaves are in the same face. Does G have a fundamental Tutte tree?

References

[1] W. T. Tutte, How to draw a graph, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 13 (1963) 743–767.

[2] Problems, in: Recent advances in graph theory (Proc. Second Czechoslovak Sympos., Prague, 1974), Academia, Prague, 1975, pp. 541–544, contributed by P. Erdős, M. Simonovits, V. T. Sós, L. Lovász, J. C. Bermond, G. O. H. Katona, T. Tarján, R. A. Brualdi, L. S. Mel′nikov and B. Toft.

[3] G. Chen, R. J. Gould, X. Yu, Graph connectivity after path removal, Combinatorica 23 (2) (2003) 185–203.

[4] M. Kriesell, Induced paths in 5-connected graphs, J. Graph Theory 36 (1) (2001) 52–58.

[5] K.-i. Kawarabayashi, O. Lee, X. Yu, Non-separating paths in 4-connected graphs, Ann. Comb. 9 (1) (2005) 47–56.

[6] K.-i. Kawarabayashi, K. Ozeki, Non-separating subgraphs after deleting many disjoint paths, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 101 (1) (2011) 54–59.

[7] Y. Hong, H.-J. Lai, Non-separating subgraphs, Discrete Math. 313 (4) (2013) 391–396.

[8] W. T. Tutte, A theorem on planar graphs, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1956) 99–116.

[9] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, R. E. Tarjan, The planar Hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete, SIAM J. Comput. 5 (4) (1976) 704–714.

[10] R. Diestel, Graph theory, 4th Edition, Vol. 173 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Heidelberg, 2010.

[11] A. Brandstädt, V. B. Le, J. P. Spinrad, Graph classes: a survey, SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.

[12] W. T. Tutte, Separation of vertices by a circuit, Discrete Math. 12 (1975) 173–184.

[13] T. Zamfirescu, Three small cubic graphs with interesting Hamiltonian properties, J. Graph Theory 4 (3) (1980) 287–292.